

National Association of University Forest Resources Programs (NAUFRP)

Executive Committee

March 8-9, 2021

Virtual Meeting

Meeting Participants:

Executive Committee: Janaki Alavalapati (President, Auburn University), David Newman (Immediate Past President, SUNY), Katy Kavanagh (President-Elect, Oregon State University), Robert Burns (Secretary/Treasurer), Andrew Storer (Education Chair, Michigan Tech University), Dennis Becker (Policy Chair, University of Idaho), Steve Shaler (International Chair, University of Maine), Karen Mock (At Large, Utah State University), Dale Greene (At-Large, University of Georgia), Bob Wagner (Research Chair, Purdue University) Red Baker (Communications Chair, University of Florida), Hans Williams (Southern Chair, Stephen F. Austin State University), Myron Floyd (At-Large, North Carolina State University), Nancy Mathews (Northeast Chair, University of Vermont), Charles Goebel (Western Chair, University of Idaho), Rich Kobe (North Central Chair, Michigan State University), Linda Nagel (APLU-BAC Liaison, Colorado State University), Adrian Leighton (Diversity Chair, Salish Kootenai College), Randy Nuckolls (General Counsel), Terri Bates (Executive Liaison)

NAUFRP Institution Representatives: Jay Sullivan (Virginia Tech), Paul Winistofer (Virginia Tech), Erin Kelly (Humboldt), Don Hodges (University of Tennessee), Eric Hanson (Oregon State University), Yeon Su Kim (Northern Arizona University), Jan Thompson (Iowa State University), Steve Dinsmore (Iowa State University), John Carroll (University of Nebraska), Bill Stone (Alabama A&M University), Kozma Naka (Alabama A&M University)

NAUFRP President Janaki Alavalapati opened the meeting. He noted the recent death of Dr. Kamran Abdollahi (Southern University) and asked for a moment of silence in his recognition. David Newman made a motion that NAUFRP will contribute \$1,000 to the Dr. Kamran Abdollahi Urban Forestry Student Scholarship Fund. Bob Wagner seconded the motion. Kamran served on the Executive Committee for more than 10 years and brought a lot to NAUFRP. The motion passed.

A motion to approve the agenda for this meeting was made by Dale Greene; seconded by Andrew Storer. There were no changes. The motion was adopted.

A motion to adopt the October 27, 2020 Executive Committee draft minutes was made by David Newman; seconded by Bob Wagner. There were no comments or changes. The motion was adopted.

Janaki noted several new people have joined the Executive Committee: Karen Mock, Dale Greene and Myron Floyd as At-Large members, Nancy Mathews as Northeast Regional Chair and Dennis Becker as Policy Chair.

Treasurer's Report, Robert Burns: Reviewed end of year 2020 and 2021 budgets. The report was circulated in advance. It was noted the University of Maryland, College Park has joined as a dues paying member. A motion to approve the 2021 budget was made by David Newman; seconded by Andrew Storer. The motion passed.

Washington Report, Randy Nuckolls: Congress is focused on Covid Relief legislation. It contains \$40 billion that would go to public and private universities. This adds to funding in the two previous relief bills for more than \$80 billion. The new Administration will release its proposed budget this month with more details in May. The Association of Public-Land Grant Universities (APLU) has begun meeting with Congressional appropriators. They have developed 'teams' for the various appropriations bills. Randy serves on the Agriculture and Interior bill teams representing NAUFRP and NAUFWP interests. The appropriations process is going to return to 'earmarks' which were discontinued in 2010. Randy urged NAUFRP members to talk to their on-campus government affairs officers about funding requests for McIntire-Stennis (McStennis), RREA, AFRI, coop units and the Joint Fire Science Research programs. They need in turn to indicate this support to Congressional Members. Daniel is to send information on the Small Business Innovation Research program to Randy/Terri for circulation. It gets about \$6 million which is distributed as grants around \$100,000 - \$150,000 and has been heavy with fire proposals. The White House Office of Science and Technology (OSTP) is something to pay attention to.

Communications Report, Red Baker: The Communications Committee has met recently; Daniel Cassidy (NIFA) and Terry Baker (SAF) joined for that virtual meeting. The committee will continue to communicate the successes of McStennis and populate the webpage with the one-pagers with plans to add videos. The Committee also talked about trying to communicate the work NAUFRP institutions are doing on subjects related to climate change. Red and Janaki have discussed the importance of communicating with the NAUFRP membership and key partners through a newsletter. NAUFRP had a newsletter in the past and this would be a good opportunity to use new technology and ways of communicating to refresh that effort. Red recommended that NAUFRP dedicate resources to help build this communications piece suggesting \$5,000 to begin with. Andrew Storer made a motion, seconded by David Newman, to provide up to \$5,000 to initiate this project. Discussion: look at what and how like organizations are communicating including our own institutions. A template should be created that can be used repeatedly and have sections like "Washington Report", "Research", "Retirements",... but be no more than 2-4 pages. The motion was approved.

Education Report, Andrew Storer: Andrew circulated several documents in advance of this meeting and they will be posted on the NAUFRP webpage. These are the Education Committee Report, Summary of Louisville K-12 Workshop and Summary of School Teacher Tours by State. A year ago, NAUFRP asked the Society of American Foresters if the Education Chair could serve in some role associated with the review of accreditation standard requirements. In January Andrew was appointed to the Educational Policy Review Committee and they are working on the next draft of the revised accreditation standards. Feedback from two surveys is being reviewed and revisions considered at this time. Andrew includes several observations in his written report. Terry Sharik is the US representative on the Global Forest Education Project. The project is a study of forest related education covering primary thru tertiary education and includes the outcomes of a survey that was administered in 2020. The survey response was low due to the pandemic. The draft is over 200 pages. NAUFRP was asked for a representative to this project by the USFS International Programs and Andrew is serving in that role. A final report will be circulated to NAUFRP. More information on this is included in his written report.

International Report, Steve Shaler: Nothing substantive has happened in the last six months. Steve needs to reach out to Alex Friend, Deputy Chief, USFS Research & Development about co-representation on IUFRO; Steve plans to do this soon. From the NAUFRP side it should probably be someone more involved with IUFRO. Steve is stepping down at the end of June for a sabbatical. He thinks it would be good to discuss the scope of what this chair covers.

Research Report, Bob Wagner: Bob's Powerpoint report focused on two ongoing projects. The first was 'Trends in Forest Research Expertise' from NAUFRP institutions over the past four decades. A manuscript is currently being drafted and will likely be published in the SAF Journal of Forestry or Forest Science. The second committee focus area is the 'US Forest and Forest Products R&D Capacity Summit'. It is in midstream. NIFA provided \$37,000 in funding last June. Because of Covid they turned to a series of on-line focus groups versus a traditional in-person meeting. A facilitator Emily Huff, a social scientist at Michigan State, has been hired. The team working on this includes Emily, Bob, Michael Goergan (US Endowment for Sustainable Communities) and Keith Gilles (Univ. of California, Berkeley, retired). They are meeting weekly and have completed a script of questions. There is a Steering Committee which guides the overall work. Some of the emerging themes are very different priorities dependent on whether they are a producer or user of R&D; support for national priorities without losing regional and local needs; catalyzing topics include carbon/climate change, mass timber, forest health; disconnects between applied and basic research. They expect to complete the focus groups in April, do analysis in May and produce a final report in June. It all should be wrapped up by Fall meeting.

Policy Report, Dennis Becker: Dennis is new as chairman. He serves on the Forest Carbon Working Group (FCWG) representing NAUFRP. Given the Biden Administration focus on climate and carbon, the FCWG is well prepared to engage. Farm Bill conversations are starting to pick up and Dennis will begin to track those more closely. What he is watching for now are early signals around federal science advisory panels. Most people believe the Biden Administration will be more favorable to the role of science in setting policy. The White House OSTP may be key to observe. Dennis is also closely watching how contracts are being awarded within federal agencies. In particular, he is watching regional offices and their budget controls in context of their hiring students as well as faculty access to contracts. He is seeing issues in his state around indemnification and this is quite concerning. Katy asked about joint venture agreements. These have been tightened up by the research station and causing faculty a lot of heartburn. She asked if anyone else having same problem; this may be a side bar conversation. Dennis is interested but does not have an answer at this point.

APLU Budget and Advocacy Committee, Linda Nagel: Linda represents the natural resources sector on APLU's Budget and Advocacy Committee (BAC). The 'unified' two-page 'budget ask' can be found at www.land-grant.org. She reviewed the one-pager posted there. It underwent a major revision in February. APLU went forward with an eight-percent increase in their ask for programs. They are now using language like 'climate change adaptation and mitigation'. The second page is very much the same and intended to be used for specific programmatic funding requests. Linda also serves on the Strategic Realignment Implementation Committee; Randy sits in on those meetings. It has rolled out a new plan which has a one-line request which would do away with the three accounts that are in the bill and report language. That top line request would include a table of programs arranged by size and it includes McStennis. Linda brought this proposal to the NAUFRP executive officers for discussion and their response was general support as long as thought is given to how any NIFA increases would be allocated. The Council of Agricultural Research, Extension and Teaching (CARET) met last week; Buck Vandersteen is a liaison between NAUFRP and CARET. We are still thinking of better ways to engage with CARET on natural resource and forestry issues.

Lisette Waits, President, National Association of University Fisheries and Wildlife Programs (NAUFWP) and faculty at the University of Idaho: Over the last two years NAUFWP has developed a Strategic Plan and re-instituted regional and committee chairs. Lisette addressed their actions on diversity and equity. Their Strategic Planning effort produced the Diversity and Equity Committee currently chaired by Nancy Mathews. A Diversity Statement was finalized last October and posted on their webpage

www.naufwp.org. Their website lists additional resources (diversity documents, readings, funding,...). NAUFWP surveyed their members late last year and Lisette reported on some of the results. There was a 68 percent response rate. Twenty-eight percent of their faculty are women; 57 percent of the undergraduates are women. A manuscript is being developed. Randy noted that over the last year NAUFWP has had several open virtual forums for their members to discuss issues and challenges around COVID and D&I issues.

Diversity Report, Adrian Leighton: At some point we should look at the SAF's new draft of accreditation standards which will have some interesting language about how institutions will track diversity especially in terms of creating an open and supportive environment. The standards will likely lead to the development of certain new courses (i.e., infrastructure for D&I).

Extension Report: Janaki was asked by Extension Chair Jeff Stringer to bring an idea to the Executive Committee for discussion on his behalf. Jeff was unable to participate in this meeting. Keith Argow has retired as Executive Director of the National Woodland Owners Association (NWOA); Mark Megalos has taken over that position. The NWOA Board, which Jeff is on, is willing to continue supporting the Family Forest Education Award. Jeff wanted to propose that this year's award recognize the innovation and technology that has come from extension this past year because of the pandemic. Bob Wagner, former Extension chair, clarified that there are really two awards: one is for a comprehensive program and the other for an individual program/project. Bob is concerned about launching a third award because the usual number of nominations are small and often from the same institutions. Since this is intended to be a one-time award, Bob feels you could replace the individual program/project award with a COVID response award for just this year only. This would keep the awards to two but allow recognition of the special circumstances.

USDA National Institute for Food and Agriculture (NIFA):

Eric Norland, National Science Liaison: Eric noted NIFA's new Director, Dr. Carrie Castille, has a doctorate in environmental policy and passion for natural resources. As of March 1st, NIFA had 215 employees; the target is about 300. NIFA is recruiting for three Institute Deputy Directors, four division directors and program leaders in the biological and social sciences. There is tremendous activity going on around climate change. NIFA is working on a climate white paper. Extension is working on a three-part Summit around Earth Day in April. Part of the leadership on climate change within USDA comes out of the office Climate Change Program Office led by Bill Howenstein who has been through several administrations. That office is coordinating for the department on climate. Eric serves as a representative in several capacities. The agencies are to revise their climate adaptation plans within the first 120 days.

Megan O'Rourke, National Program Leader (NPL) for Ecosystems: Megan is new to NIFA and has a climate science background coming from Virginia Tech. She manages three programs. The first is the agro-ecosystem management program with emphasis on new management techniques (includes forestry), It links system health to other indicators of sustainability (forestry is a quarter of this portfolio). The budget for the latter is about \$650,000 for projects with an annual overall budget of approximately \$6-7 million annually. Her other two programs are the pollinator health program and the sustainable agricultural systems program. The latter is a large cap program (\$10 million) open to any system integrated research, teaching, extension program that is trans-disciplinary and has transformative impacts on agriculture, forestry, and natural resources. Megan feels it is 'ripe' for forestry. To date they have not funded anything forestry focused but she has talked to several people about how to craft such a program. Randy notes that Megan is an example of a new program leader and there are offers out for three

additional program leaders. A 'To Do' for NAUFRP is to get acquainted with the new national program leaders, learn what the priorities of their program are and volunteer faculty for peer review panels. We can do this through technology while we cannot travel. This task falls under our research portfolio.

Daniel Cassidy, NPL, Forestry and Bioeconomy (oversees the McStennis, RREA, SBIR and other forestry related programs): Daniel had a successful SBIR panel several weeks ago and is looking forward to announcing awards which are very much focused on wildfires. He is really pleased about the rate of McStennis funds draw down. They are about to release third and fourth quarter funds. Randy confirmed that Daniel will let us know if there are any schools with two-year monies subject to being returned to the Treasury. Daniel said we are overdue for an ATR (Administrative Technical Representative) meeting and that the original planning committee has been talking about doing something late this year. It would be along the lines of this meeting – two days, probably virtual and address program policy, administration and highlight good McStennis projects. Daniel said it will not be a problem to extend two-year monies under Covid policy this year.

Carrie Castille, NIFA Director: Dr. Castille provided background on herself. She did her research on how to improve conservation in agriculture and forestry. When at the Louisiana State University Agricultural Center, she developed a Master Farmer Program based on forestry's Best Management Practices (BMPs) for water quality modeled after the Master Logger Program. Similarly, she looked to forestry's prescribed burning and fire weather forecasting to develop a program for sugar cane burning. Castille discussed USDA priorities which are: 1-containing the pandemic including economic recovery 2-ensuring racial justice and equity 3- ensuring food and nutrition security (access to markets) 4- rebuilding the rural economy 5- addressing the impacts of climate change. She recognizes the role healthy forests play in climate change and wants to leverage expertise in conservation, science, and research. NIFA is working to rebuild their staff. Her priority is finding the right people. Janaki says it is welcoming that she understands forestry and natural resources. Adrian observed FRAC has not met since October 2016 and asked if she had any sense if this is being discussed. She says they have not gotten any guidance yet but will ensure as that Eric and Daniel stay in communication with NAUFRP on this. Robert Bonnie is now the climate advisor to USDA Secretary Vilsak and will bring substantial insight from the forestry perspective. When he talks about climate 'smart' he means food, agriculture, and forestry. Eric and Megan have provided 'forestry' insight on NIFA programs to Bonnie.

Other comments/questions for Dr. Castille from the Executive Committee:

- Forestry is being better represented at NIFA due to Daniel and Eric as well as NAUFRP representative visits to the NIFA staff. Forestry differs from agriculture due to its long-term perspective and there is concern that this resonates well at NIFA.
- There has been significant erosion of federal programs that have supported forest products research at universities. NIFA is urged to support additional funding for wood products research and innovative product development.
- Castille was asked how NIFA will show its commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion -- what will NIFA do differently than the past and what new initiatives will there be? Castille expects the USDA Equity Council to provide guidance as to where the agency needs to be. NIFA will also ensure their panels and workforce are representative.
- Castille was asked if they have thought about how to introduce their (new) staff to their stakeholder communities? NAUFRP wants to be engaged in that effort. Castille said this came up with APLU. It's imperative and she wants to make sure they are doing it and doing it right.
- RREA funding has remained stagnant but is needed to take information generated by McStennis and other research efforts to our customers.

- Suggestions for getting attention from the new Administration for McStennis or RREA. Castille said she has a three-step communication plan: 'know your stuff, know who to stuff and keep on stuffing'. NAUFRP should keep on stuffing. She wants to be an advocate for us; make sure she has information. Tell her where NAUFRP fits in around carbon.

1890 Discussion: Janaki asked for ideas on how to re-energize the relationship with the 1890 schools noting that we have a representative on the Executive Committee who is not an active participant. A suggestion was to ask him to make a presentation to the Executive Committee on what they are doing. They have a lot more going on beyond NAUFRP and are visible on the Hill. Daniel and Eric went to CA several years ago and met with all the schools there. This might be a model when travel can resume: visit the states that have 1890s, 1994, 1862s with individual visits and then bring them together for strategic planning on where/how they can work together. Adrian suggested the idea of a 1994 liaison; the 1890s and 1994 liaisons could work together and with the diversity chair on initiatives.

Doug Steele, Vice President, Food, Agriculture, and Natural Resources, APLU: CARET met virtually two weeks ago. CARET includes volunteer delegates who advocate on behalf of the deans. They began delivering the FY22 unified 'asks' which consists of six capacity lines, AFRI and three 1994 competitive lines. The overall ask is an eight percent increase that amounts to about a \$100 million increase to the NIFA budget which is somewhat aspirational but still thought realistic in today's environment. Another ambitious priority is the agriculture research infrastructure proposal for \$11.5 billion. They are trying to identify a vehicle/path for funding -- perhaps the Biden infrastructure bill or 2023 Farm Bill. APLU will host a webinar on Earth Day that will try to strengthen the North American knowledge zone working with partners in Mexico and Canada. The BAA voted to join the Food and Agriculture Climate Alliance (FACA). APLU met last week with the White House Office of Science and Technology (OSTP) and with the Office of Community Outreach and Engagement. Linda worked with APLU last year to put together a program that addressed mental health and well-being. It was very well received, and they are going to try and do it again this year. The Biden Administration's messaging is about climate, diversity equity and inclusion and supporting rural areas. The President's upcoming budget will provide a strong idea of the Administration's program priorities. Randy noted that Doug's leadership has elevated our interests as well as NAUFRP's within APLU. Doug said they are focused on carbon sequestration guidelines, certification, carbon credits. They have been told that bipartisan legislation will move forward in the next couple of weeks on how to reduce the carbon footprint. Everyone is talking about climate, but they really don't know what that means programmatically. Doug said so far it has been a challenge to connect with transition teams who are now moving to permanent appointments. Janaki asked if Robert Bonnie is engaged with APLU. Doug said he is a good friend and they expect to connect with him in his new role.

Regional Reports

North Central Rich Kobe: The region has been having quarterly Zoom calls with a focus on building relationships. There have had plenty of experiences to share this last year because of Covid, especially around teaching and field courses. A substantive conversation they have had recently was collaborating on on-line courses. They are looking more towards specialized courses, potentially hybrid, on-line field courses for schools in proximity to each other. They are aware that there may be/ have been a western consortium doing on-line courses and Rich would be very interested in learning more about that experience -- its nature, model, mechanisms, kind of courses and whether it is still active. If anyone knows please reach out to him. For example, Michigan State has developed on-line courses for forest carbon and climate change both for credit (certificate) and non-credit professional education.

Southern Report, Hans Williams: Hans has been working on the Southern Comparative Data Survey and hopes to send the results out to participating schools in early April. The Forest Landowners Association (FLA) has invited Southern NAUFRP to join their annual convention in June; another possibility may be to meet with the Southern Group of State Foresters at their annual meeting, also in June. Hans is leaning towards FLA who plans an in-person meeting in Williamsburg, VA around June 16th.

Western Report, Chuck Goebel: Western NAUFRP is planning a summer meeting. Assuming things continue to improve, tentative planning is to meet in person at OSU. It may be blended, allowing for virtual. He is pulling together topics for the group. Addressing Rich's question, Chuck is unaware of a western consortium but will ask around and get back to Rich.

Northeastern Report, Nancy Mathews: Robert prepared a PPT for her and they have talked about her new role. (*She is not going to present the PPT at this time.*) She loves Rich's idea for a consortium on sharing courses. The University of Vermont is having a current conversation with Paul Smith College about a fire ecology class. Maybe a survey could be orchestrated to determine areas where we need help on and find who has what courses for a more systematic approach. Robert added that the region has not had in person meetings for a while but there has been discussion about the need to update curriculum, skills development and collaboration on research. Janaki noted Nancy's work around the D&I survey for NAUFWP. If there are additional results, perhaps those could be shared with NAUFRP. Nancy said it would be helpful and welcome if NAUFRP wants to repeat the diversity survey for forestry programs. One point Nancy wanted to underscore was of the 26 responses they had back, only about half required diversity courses for their students and only 1 or 2 programs had courses that related specifically to diversity and natural resources and environmental justice. She is happy to interface with both groups.

NAUFRP Reviewer Data Base The old NAUFRP webpage had a reviewer data base that could not be transferred to the new website because of platform issues. Hannah Abbots did the webpage re-design and was willing to work on a new data base but that stalled when seeking NIFA input in the midst of the agency's move to Kansas City, MO. Janaki said Myron has volunteered to help oversee this. Daniel said the data base has been very useful; if we do not have forestry reviewers, NIFA is not going to be funding forestry projects. David added that when we did this previously we sent a message to the listserv to get the deans and directors to have their faculty sign up and we had a strong response; that will need to be done again. Linda wondered that since many of our group are also members of NAUFWP if it would make sense to expand the data base to include our sister association; it might also serve numerous other entities as a reviewer data base. She does not think it would be a heavy lift to expand this base to include natural resources more broadly. Janaki asked if we need to add money to the budget for this. Terri and David indicated this had already been approved.

2021 Fall Meetings At this point SAF is planning an in-person meeting in Sacramento. NAUFRP should prepare for in-person meetings but be prepared to pivot if things turn a different way. If we do go forward with in-person meetings we should have a Zoom option. David pointed out to Terri the complications of having a zoom set-up. We would need to consider how Zoom attendees would be projected and expect additional costs. (*Good example of pivoting was last year's Missoula meeting – John Goodburn, ask Adrian about*). Randy believes most of the IT people at conferences are getting pretty good with these hybrid setups out of necessity. Are there member schools that can help? The nearest would be UC-Berkeley which can be a 1 ½ to 4-hour trip one way. It would be useful to touch base with Keith Gilles to see if there are some good venue options to consider (i.e., Wineries, like bourbon tour in Louisville). We will plan a summer planning session on the fall meetings.

Janaki returned to the newsletter project to discuss the timeframe. Red wants to be sure we time the cycles around DC and NAUFRP fall meetings. He is looking at March, June, Sept, December. Randy urged putting something out before the annual General Assembly meeting as an intro that will promote the meetings and then in March after the Executive Committee meeting. Linda wondered about building a distribution list, assuming it will be broader than just us. Red said he doesn't have all the answers, but his thinking is to begin with the membership and close partners and expand from there. Janaki agrees; this is about what kind of service we are providing to the membership. Close partners would be those like NAUFWP, FCWG, NIFA. Red plans to have two newsletters out prior to the fall meeting.

Terry Baker, Executive Officer and Carol Redelsheimer, Director of Science and Education, Society of American Foresters (SAF): Terry noted SAF's national office move to 2121 K Street in Washington, DC. SAF's transition memo to the Biden Administration included focus and funding support for McStennis for the first time. The Certified Forester (CF) program review was completed just over a year ago. One of the results is the hiring of a new staff member to work on the CF program. Terry also heard NAUFRP's interest in having marketing materials for promoting the CF program and they are working on this too. SAF has had to adjust to the pandemic in different ways entailing a 2020 virtual convention and three Working Group webinars. The latter had good response rates -- 200-300 registered for these. They have been going thru a Strategic Planning exercise for the past year honing down what they will be working on operationally. It is hoped that this year's convention can be in-person but they are preparing for it to be hybrid. They have been becoming more pro-active on policy matters by reviewing existing position statements and making recommendations for new more contemporary ones. That includes recently adopting new ones for Forest Recreation and Water Resources; several more are on the docket.

Carol said the Educational Policy Review Committee is in the process of refining the proposed revisions based on the feedback they had from the surveys. She highlighted some major changes she sees coming. These include eliminating/streamlining redundancies in the standards; change to the urban forestry curriculum standard; greater emphasis on student soft skills. The biggest change, and she is a little surprised there was not more feedback, is moving from a 'magical' number of eight faculty to a broader way of looking at that. Rather than dictating the eight faculty they will now require there be a 'sufficient' number of faculty to demonstrate that disciplinary expertise is present to deliver the program. They are looking to add context statements to the new accreditation handbook to help programs, visiting teams and accreditation committees interpret what they are looking for more consistently. They are aiming to have a final draft by the end of May. Carol noted she is happy to share the working draft of the new standards but cannot guarantee they will not change before finalized. Carol was asked for more information on changes to the urban forestry standard. The biggest things she sees are emphasis on planning, familiarity and knowledge about urban planning commissions, policies that affect public and private landowners, a little more emphasis on arboriculture skills and knowledge, and awareness of community groups with differing needs and interests. Carol was asked how a program will demonstrate it has the discipline expertise and what kind of documentation will be needed that says 'yes' they meet all of the core competencies? This question is still under discussion; she thinks the intent will be to look more at faculty expertise and the courses they are teaching and then explaining to SAF how the institution thinks they are meeting those requirements. David noted that as institutions become more adept with on-line education it will increasingly be used and asked if this will be an issue with the guidelines? Carol anticipates this is a question that will come up more and more; she does not see anything in their guidelines that would prevent that. She thinks there will need to be discussion in cases where you are sharing a course with another institution and counting the eight faculty members. David thinks this is an important point if departments continue to shrink and the question becomes what is the critical mass for a program. Carol agrees that this will be an ongoing discussion but reminds that the final consideration is

the purpose of accreditation is to ensure professional education is provided to students. We need to ensure we are evolving and adapting as needed.

Scott Jones, CEO, Forest Landowners Association (FLA): Red is currently on the Board of Directors. FLA has often hosted the Southern NAUFRP meeting at their annual convention. The convention moves around the country and Scott invited the other NAUFRP regions to consider holding their meeting in conjunction with FLA. FLA has supported funding for McStennis for many years. FLA welcomes the opportunity to publish research papers and other materials focused on improving management on private forest lands in their bi-annual magazine. They have members in 45 states and are experiencing growth in the northeast and pacific northwest. In doing so, they are working hard to ensure they cover content that members need in all regions. The Forest Landowner Foundation offers student scholarships. This year it is funding 15 scholarships for students at the University of Vermont, Humboldt, Penn State, Oregon State and a number of southern universities. They are looking for non-traditional students. Another program is a fellowship in memory of Rob Olszewski which was developed to bring science-based approaches to forestry policy making. FLA launched their public policy institute launched several years ago. That program takes students to Washington DC and pays their way. Scott would like to expand this to have students attend the national conference. Another example of the Foundation's work includes an annual survey of costs, trends and silvicultural activities on private lands in the South. It is housed at Auburn University. The Foundation partnered to help modernize the survey. This year's rate of response is the highest ever. Jay Sullivan said his students came back raving about the policy institute. FLA is meeting June 16-19 in Williamsburg, VA.

Dave Tenny, President and CEO, National Alliance of Forest Owners: Dave said NAFO spent most of last year preparing for what might happen in November and for once they guessed right. They prepared for significant change in the government's leadership for both the Administration and Congress. In that process they came out with a robust plan of action that adheres to a simple narrative: forests provide healthy markets, clean air and water, wildlife habitat and jobs. Each part has a work stream attached to it. For markets their number one priority is ensuring they have a workforce that can get the job done. For air, they are focused on climate change. Climate change priorities follow another simple narrative: markets, plus trees plus wood equals mitigation at scale. NAFO wants to repeatedly emphasize the fact that markets for forest products are what are going to keep the forests that are already there. They are gathering a lot of data to demonstrate just how much carbon we are talking about. On the trees side they have developed a carbon framework that will help them in a variety of contexts to drive opportunities for increased carbon sequestration in our forests. That framework will help with the carbon bank that Robert Bonnie and Secretary Vilsak at USDA are talking about. NAFO wants to ensure any carbon bank will appropriately recognize protocol and maintain rigor and increase participation. They do not want barriers to entry to any program established by USDA. They would like to work with USDA to establish a good housekeeping stamp of approval for existing protocols in the private sector to build confidence in the marketplace. NAFO has founded a Wildlife Conservation Initiative and is part of a broader effort called Conservation Without Conflict. NAFO's CEOs signed a set of common Principles with the Nature Conservancy, Environmental Defense Fund, American Forest Foundation and American Forests last fall outlining a common vision for nature-based solutions from private working forests. NAFO is part of the Food and Agriculture Climate Alliance (FACA), a newer organization broadly including forestry and agriculture land-based groups. Asked for his perception of 30x30, Dave said candidly that they are hearing 'we don't know yet' from those in the Administration. They are still defining it; there are some who want it to be a preservation initiative. There are others (us) who want it to be focused on working forests/lands. Dave was asked how the term 'nature-based solutions' is being interpreted. Dave said the good news is we have succeeded in communicating the understanding that there is a relationship between

markets and land/forests and it is a critical role of rural communities. In answer to what is happening to monetize the value of forest carbon, Dave said the concept of a carbon bank is being developed but a lot of thinking is still needed. A carbon bank can do a lot of things: be a mitigation tool to monetize a carbon set aside; stimulate advantage lending to pursue carbon projects in the private sector are some.

Alex Friend, Deputy Chief and John Rothlisberger, Area Budget Coordinator, US Forest Service, Research and Development (R&D): Alex presented a PPT ; Terri has a copy and can make available. Forest Service R&D is down to 440 research scientists from about 500. He reviewed the R&D enterprise: organization, research forests, publications. Slide 6 compared research scientist density between Europe and the US. Alex reviewed USDA priorities. Current R&D priorities are applied science to support stewardship and improve forest conditions, forest inventory and analysis, enhancing the wildland fire system and wood product and market innovations. A Department Strategic Plan is expected in July so these priorities may change. Alex reviewed the agency's budget. It is going thru a modernization process. Slide 14 depicted Investments in Partnership by number of agreements, funding, and percentage of R&D budget. Twenty percent went to universities last year and Alex expects it to be pretty much the same this year. Answering a question about how this new process may have changed how money comes into the universities Alex said that in the past, they could get funds from a grant for salaries and use those salary savings towards university agreements; that particular mechanism is not in place anymore but that should be the only thing that has changed. John Rothlisberger added that the new salary and expense budget item, which takes up more than three quarters of their appropriation, has a very strong constraint: those dollars can only be used to pay for FS federal employee salaries within R&D and no other resources in general can be used to pay for those salaries. John said with respect to funds coming to the universities, they are seeing some uncertainty and extra cautiousness from the research stations as they try and adapt to this new structure and what it will mean. Katy expressed concern that the joint venture agreements are becoming much more limited in what/how they can use that vehicle; this is forcing OSU into full indirect cost agreements only. Alex wants to follow-up on this question because there is no reason why that vehicle should be restricted. Randy noted we have had discussions that pre-date Alex on this matter. Paying for graduate assistantship tuition was an issue. David said there is also the issue of overhead; maxing it at 20% is incredibly problematic. Another issue has been that some of the constraints were not the same with other USDA agencies. Alex said he would be happy to follow up on these issues if NAUFRP will bring them to him. The overhead amount may be a challenge but there are ways to use other agreements. Janaki said we would follow up. Alex said FRAC is in the pipeline. A new slate of nominations has been approved and they may be able to meet in June. David noted we have generally met with the R&D leadership team in the past and asked if it will be possible to meet virtually with Alex's team – it does not have to be a big group or a long meeting. Alex will see if they can do it next time their FSRET team meets.

Janaki reviewed that there was agreement to develop a periodic newsletter and reviewer data base. Discussion on whether to join FACA. There was agreement to do this.

Further discussion included:

- concern about sending a message that professional standards can be met by relying on the virtual world. It can work with and supplement some courses but used too much and it would have a negative impact. Standard courses like silviculture should not be virtual but there are examples of specialized courses (Michigan State, University of Vermont).

– the magic of having eight faculty members: does SAF have any data for how many institutions this has been a barrier for. The number eight was derived on the assumption that faculty are splitting time

Commented [MB1]:

between teaching and research so perhaps there can be different rules for different types of institutions (i.e., teaching only). Are there not explicit disallowances for 2-year and 4-year institutions for sharing faculty in the headcounts? It would seem that should be part of the discussion.

- concern that there are not diverse opinions on the topics we discuss. It may be of value to reach out to a broader range of groups than we usually do. Examples might be The Nature Conservancy, land trusts, Proforestation, Charismatic Carbon. This could apply to federal agencies beyond NIFA and USFS. Example with me the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Department of Energy (BIRDI). Additionally, this could include hearing more from the recreation and outdoor segments of the forest community. Randy recommended the president-elect engage on this.

- the idea of inviting Provosts, Assistant Provosts, and research vice-presidents to our meetings.

Meeting adjourned.

*Minutes Approved
October 4, 2021*